



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/046,101   | 01/11/2002  | Keith A. Ranieri     | FIRS-2994           | 2867             |
| 5409 7590 02/25/2009<br>SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS<br>22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE<br>SUITE 302<br>LATHAM, NY 12110 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| LEIVA, FRANK M   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 3714   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 02/25/2009   |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/046,101

**Applicant(s)**

RANIERE, KEITH A.

**Examiner**

FRANK M. LEIVA

**Art Unit**

3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frank M. Leiva.(3) Arlin Olsen.(2) Dmitry Suhol.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Weiss.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion was centered on the amended limitation to claim 1, wherein the applicant wishes to imply that the cash and scrip paid to the player after winning the game of uncertain outcome are derived strictly from the winning. The examiner argued the claim as written does not provide this meaning and that further amending is required. No agreement was reached and examiner will reconsider the amendments after officially submitted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dmitry Suhol/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714